

### **Talking Points for Laura Duchnak call, Thursday, 1:30 pm**

- We appreciate the hard work and thorough analysis that the Navy's technical team is doing on trench soil samples. We gave our support for your approach in writing.
- I understand the Mayor wants a predictable transfer date. Given the uncertainties inherent in this process, we cannot make schedule prognostication based on assumptions on what we might find. Presenting an overly optimistic schedule does not serve any of us in the long run. We won't agree to your schedule without bounds and caveats.
- Examples of reasons to be cautious about timing in addition to the above:
  - Parcel C has already shown 42% of survey units were either already confirmed to have falsification or are recommended for more sampling.
  - Several years ago, Tetra Tech already found more remediation needed when they resampled.
  - Parcel G had more history of rad work, so it potentially has more contamination and more associated motivation for falsification than Parcel C.
  - Cleanups in general often need more rounds of sampling and more remediation.
  - Our technical teams are only now beginning to analyze the buildings, and last fall, both EPA and CDPH recommended rescans based on evidence.
  - Regulatory agencies need adequate time to review the Navy's work and we still have not received review forms yet.
- On community involvement, we encourage more proactive engagement with a variety of groups in the affected neighborhood, in accordance with both your radiological Communications Plan and your Community Involvement Plan. For example, we recommended months ago for Navy staff to bring your technical advisor and community liaison to make the rounds to interested groups for "meet and greet" sessions.

## **EPA Comments on Navy revised Communications Plan**

**From:** Yogi, David

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 20, 2017 3:59 PM

**To:** Derek Robinson (derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil) <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Koenig, Kellie/SDO <Kellie.Koenig@ch2m.com>

**Cc:** Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>; LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>

**Subject:** EPA Comments on HPNS Communication Plan 2.0

Derek and Kellie:

Thank you for updating the Radiological Communication Plan, now called Rev. 2.0, and considering EPA's comments to Rev. 1.5. We appreciate you incorporating most of our comments along this process to date. Attached is a Word file with EPA's comments on the Rev. 2.0 for your review. I would like to highlight several of these comments below that were part of EPA's specific recommendations to the Navy hand delivered at the December 7, 2016 Tiger Team kick-off meeting and the recommendation letter mailed to the Navy dated December 14, 2016. The following are a few key points EPA wants to emphasize to the Navy as it moves forward with its outreach:

- Contract a community liaison as quickly as possible and have this person share contact information and updates on the investigation with various community leaders, at venues and present at established group meetings. This person should contact the chairperson to ask if they can be on their next meeting agenda. This person should also work with the Navy media point to contact radio stations with the most listeners from the community to present information on the investigation and updates.

- Establish HPNS Environmental Cleanup Center staffed for office hours allowing the public to speak with Navy representatives about the investigation. This can be three hours a week with published availability hours at the information repository on the base.

- For the two remaining public meetings, include a reasonable public comment periods for key documents on the investigation.

- Dr. Higley should review key documents, and in consultation with the community, submit comments to the Navy. EPA requests the Navy develop an approach to better integrate Dr. Higley and market her services to local stakeholders.

- Create a "Feedback Loop" that transparently shows how questions and comments from stakeholders are addressed through the course of investigation.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

David

## Exchange about request to Navy to present at 6/21 EJ Task Force Meeting

From: Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [[ [HYPERLINK "mailto:william.d.franklin@navy.mil" \]\]](mailto:william.d.franklin@navy.mil)  
Sent: Tuesday, June 06, 2017 5:49 PM  
To: Yogi, David <[ [HYPERLINK "mailto:Yogi.David@epa.gov" \]>](mailto:Yogi.David@epa.gov)  
Cc: Chesnutt, John <[ [HYPERLINK "mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov" \]>](mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov); Ostrowski, Kimberly A CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <[ [HYPERLINK "mailto:kimberly.ostrowski@navy.mil" \]>](mailto:kimberly.ostrowski@navy.mil)

We understand and appreciate EPA's philosophy and approach regarding participation in EJ Taskforce meetings, however, the Navy does not share that philosophy. We do not believe that EJ Taskforce meetings are a productive venue to share information about the environmental cleanup efforts underway at HPNS. In recent interactions with Greenaction they have demonstrated that they do not have a genuine interest in obtaining information and their agenda has been combative with the Navy and disruptive in a public forum.

Our top priority is to complete the radiological reevaluation, ensure the property is safe, and to transfer property to the city for redevelopment. To achieve this in a timely manner, the Navy must ensure we spend our scarce resources wisely. We have a robust community outreach plan and have had several recent opportunities for the public to participate and receive information. We also have several more public events planned in the near future that Greenaction is welcome to attend. Additionally, Dr. Higley has reached out to Greenaction to offer a teleconference to discuss concerns and potential Navy attendance at a meeting but Greenaction has not responded to the offer.

We have also advised that if Greenaction would like our participation in Taskforce meetings then Mr. Angel should contact us directly via an email to Derek Robinson, and we will need to receive that request 30-days in advance to allow time to prepare.

For these reasons the Navy will need to decline your request to participate in the EJ Taskforce meeting scheduled later this month.

R, Bill

-----Original Message-----

From: Yogi, David [[ [HYPERLINK "mailto:Yogi.David@epa.gov" \]\]](mailto:Yogi.David@epa.gov)  
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 2:31 PM  
To: Ostrowski, Kimberly A CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO  
Cc: Chesnutt, John  
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Request for USEPA to present an update on the Shipyard/Tetra Tech situation to the Bayview Hunters Point EJ Task Force on June 21st

Hi Kim,

On Wednesday, May 24, EPA staff forwarded to Navy staff the email below requesting a presentation June 21, 2017, to the Bayview Hunters Point Environmental Justice Task Force about "Tiger Team" efforts related to Tetra Tech. EPA's position is that it is more appropriate for the Navy, rather than EPA, to be making presentations about the Tetra Tech assessment, as it is the Navy who is leading this effort. I am requesting that the Navy attend the next EJ Task Force monthly meeting and provide an update on

your efforts. Jackie Lane and Lily Lee from EPA will also attend and will be available to address any questions related to EPA's role. Your increased engagement efforts have meaningfully increased community knowledge of facts about the Navy's actions. Here is another opportunity, especially since the next Navy's public meeting on the investigation isn't scheduled until September at the earliest.

In addition, given the considerable preparation you have already done for the open house February 8, 2017, the bus tour April 8, 2017, the upcoming June 28, 2017, meeting with the Mayor, and the August 7, 2017 meeting with the homeowners' association, your participation will not require much more effort. The fact sheets, presentations, and posters you have already distributed will be a valuable resource to share information and clarify misconceptions. EPA's experience with this and other EJ Task Force groups throughout California has been that in-person information sharing, open dialogue, and listening to community concerns help to build trust and understanding of complex information.

In addition, the Navy's Radiological Communication Plan and Community Involvement Plan (CIP) support the notion of using existing community group meetings and forums as preferred communication methods, based on recent surveys. The Navy already routinely offers to attend meetings of over 65 groups in the neighborhood, and this approach is more resource-efficient than Navy-hosted meetings.

Let me know if you would like to discuss further. Thanks!

Best,

David